

ry?" Is that true? If that could be made of if you dare put that upon your record—if I can assert that you hold the country by the stomach, then you have a right to go there with slaves. If we of the North have united with of the South in an expedition of piracy, and

[illegible]

tion and continued acquiescence (in the name of the Republic) into legal slavery. The Republic, in the end, is held only by force, in time, by the law and by the judgment of men, becomes a tyrant, and the Republic is lost. And we are told by the Senator from Mr. Mason that the posterity of such a Republic will be a magical invention—these words, Roman were *treason*—"The child follows the condition of the mother." Admire!—philosophical—rather Christian maxim!!! If the mother be in war, it seems then the will of a just God that the child should be born in war, for her offspring to the remotest time be doomed to Slavery. What sublime motto! What lovely justice combine to sanctify wars in that new decalogue of freedom wars, it is our destiny to give to the world

[illegible]

fought for this country and conquered it, a solemn appeal is made to us—"Have we girded our blood with yours in acquiring this?" But did we mingle our blood with theirs for the purpose of wresting this country from this people? That is the question I did not say so six months ago. You dare say so now! You may say that it was purchased from Louisiana or as Florida was, with the treasure of the country; and then we come to a discussion of another proposition: What do you acquire to establish Slavery there? It was about to ask of some gentleman—the one from South Carolina, for instance—whose glance has comprehended the history of

world, what he supposes will be the issue abroad of our Mexican war, and these our acquisitions, if we should give to them the title which he desires? I do not speak of the priority of slave labor being carried any further will waive that question entirely. What which the Senator from Vermont has told morning, and of which we have heard during the last three weeks? And how history read by the side of that? Every floods across the Atlantic comes freighted death-groans of a King; every vessel that your shores, bear with her tidings that times of the Old World are at last becoming that they are seeking, through blood, an

ter—badly and madly, it may be—but not less resolutely—deliverance from the fetters have held them in bondage. Who are the most the whole of Europe. And it is only a year ago, I believe, that the officer of the old Empire who holds sway in Tunis, on his slave markets of the world, whose prize formerly received those of our people taken the high seas and made slaves to their announced to the world that all should be free. And, if I am not mistaken, it is found that this magic line which the South Carolina believes has been drawn across the globe which we inhabit, with the viceroy of Freedom and Slavery—“Ides

brings this very Tunis into that region is, as some supposed, by ordinance of nature, in he held in bondage! All over the world is vocal with the shouts of men made free. What all mean? It means that they have been freed from *political servitude*; and in God's name if it be a boon to mankind to be free from *real servitude*, must it not be accepted as some gratulation that they have been relieved from *personal servitude*—absolute subjection to arbitrary power of others? What do we say? I am not speaking of the propriety of this may be all wrong, and these poor fellows who have stout hands and willing hearts to be used in Africa.

to tell their creed, may of very unreason-  
able fighting for it. It may be all wrong to  
head of a King, or send him across the  
It may be highly improper and foolish in  
to send away Metetrnich, and say, "We  
into this business ourselves." According  
doctrine preached in these Halls—in free-  
case—instead of sending shouts of gratula-  
the water to these people, we should send  
groans and commiseration for their folly  
on them to beware how they take this  
into their own hands—informing them  
universal liberty is a curse; that as one man  
with a right to govern an Empire, he an-  
nity must continue to exercise that po-

Under your law, the chain follows the law in this country in 1776, that Kings had to rule us, did rule us. George lit a "partus sequitur partem," my son inherited the crown, "he follows the condition of the father" he is born to be your ruler?" your father said "this is not true, this shall be law no longer. I look for a moment at the doings of our old time, 1776. *Thou*, sir, our father, he preceded, lifted up their hands and appealed to God of Justice, the common Father of

to deliver them and their posterity from  
which proclaimed that "Kings were born  
They (the men of 1776) did not believe  
man was born "booted and spurred"  
another. And if, as they said, no man  
to ride another, did it not follow, that no  
rightfully be born to *serve* another. Sir,  
days, Virginia and Virginia's sons, Wash-  
and Jefferson, had as little respect for that  
*peritus singulari vestrum*, as for "their  
dogmas, "Kings are born to rule?" I in-  
our history, sir, that the men of that  
ancient mon, earnest, honest men, they  
meant what they said. From their de-  
"all men are born equally free." I infer

their digmonts, no man, by the law of France, was born to be a slave; and, therefore, not by any other law to be born a slave. I think this maxim of Kings being born free and others being born only to serve, argues the same family, and ought to have governed the same place whence I imagine they came, together. I do not think that your *quaker ventrums* had much quarter shown in town on a certain day you may remember. I think that when the lion of England on the dust, beneath the talons of your eagle, Cornwallis surrendered to George Washington, that maxim, that a man is born to rule and not to be seen, was again for ever

100- / 40 Hm; 100- W 100 800m 2000m 2000m 100-











